



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,521	11/01/2001	Timothy Samuel Gorton	S63.2H-14594-US01	6660
490 7590 03/19/2010 VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A. SUITE 400, 6640 SHADY OAK ROAD EDEN PRAIRIE, MN 55344				
EXAMINER				
PATTERSON, MARC A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,521

Applicant(s)

GIRTON ET AL.

Examiner

MARC A. PATTERSON

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,21,22,24 and 27-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,21,22,24 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

1. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 24 and 27 – 28 as being unpatentable over Freiburger et al (U.S. H1978 H), of record on page 2 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

NEW REJECTIONS

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claim 32 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The tubular graft of Claim 32 is subjected to expansion, and a node and fibril structure is not excluded, whereas Claims 2 - 3, 21 – 22, 24 and 27 – 21 are directed to PTFE that is non – expanded and that has no node and fibril structure.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 32 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,285).

Dillon discloses a material consisting of an interpenetrating polymer network comprising PTFE and a solid particulate component which is incompatible with the PTFE (column 2, lines 12 - 17) and a dissolving medium in which the component is soluble (mixed into kerosene, therefore at least partially soluble before it is completely crosslinked; column 3, line 9); discrete domains of the component are therefore distributed through the PTFE and are extractable therefrom to create pores.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 21 – 22, 24 and 27 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houser et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,361,559 B1) in view of Clapper (U.S. Patent No. 5,744,515).

With regard to Claims 3, 21, 24 and 27 - 30, Houser et al teach a vascular graft (bypass graft; column 7, lines 3 - 7) that is tubular (column 7, lines 23 - 25) comprising an extruded composite of materials that are selected from a group including silicone and PTFE (column 7, lines 3 - 7). It therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided for an extruded composite of silicone and PTFE, as the group disclosed by Houser et al

includes silicone and PTFE. Houser et al therefore disclose a composite having discrete domains of the silicone distributed throughout the PTFE that are extractable from the PTFE to create pores and a bulk density of 0.2 and 0.5 g/cc, as stated in paragraph 0035 of the specification, therefore permitting tissue ingrowth; Houser et al do not disclose a PTFE that is expanded or that has a node and fibril structure; a non - expanded PTFE having no node and fibril structure is therefore disclosed by Houser et al. Houser et al fail to disclose a composite that is an interpenetrating polymer network

Clapper teaches a room - temperature vulcanizing silicone in the making of a vascular graft for the purpose of obtaining a graft that closely approximates natural vessels (column 5, lines 51 -65). One of ordinary skill in the art would therefore have recognized the advantage of providing for the silicone of Clapper in Houser et al, which comprises vascular graft, depending on the desired similarity to natural vessels of the end product.

It therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have provided for a room - temperature vulcanizing silicone in Houser et al, therefore an interpenetrating polymer network, because the silicone is crosslinked, in order to obtain a graft that closely approximates natural vessels as taught by Clapper.

With regard to Claim 22, Houser et al fail to disclose a particle size of 5 to 100 microns. However, would therefore be obvious for one of ordinary skill to select particle size, through routine optimization, depending on the desired speed of mixing, as a composite is disclosed by Houser et al.

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houser et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,361,559 B1) in view of Clapper (U.S. Patent No. 5,744,515) and further in view of Chuter (U.S. Patent No. 6,293,969).

Houser et al and Clapper disclose a PTFE extrudate comprising extractable polymeric material in a vascular graft as discussed above. Houser et al and Clapper fail to disclose a radially distensible stent positioned axially about the extrudate.

Chuter teaches PTFE (PTFE membrane material; column 2, lines 49- 53) comprised in first and second stems (first and second stent graft components; column 2, lines 45 - 47) with one stent positioned about the other stent (the stent components are at different levels, one below the other; column 2, lines 28 - 29) for the purpose of obtaining a stent which is biologically inert (column 2, lines 49 - 53). One of ordinary skill in the art would therefore have recognized the advantage of providing for the stent of Chuter in Houser et al and Clapper, which comprises PTFE, depending on the desired inertness of the end product.

It therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have provided for a stem, therefore radially distensible, positioned axially about the tubular extrudate in Houser et al and Clapper in order to obtain a stent which is biologically inert as taught by Chuter.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

8. Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections of the previous Action have been carefully considered but have not been found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues on page 4 of the remarks dated November 12, 2010, that the claimed non – expanded PTFE having the claimed density provides advantages on known ePTFE materials.

However, because the PTFE of Houser et al and Clapper is non - expanded and would, after extraction, have the density of the claimed PTFE, the advantages are also provided by the PTFE of Houser et al and Clapper.

Applicant also argues that Dillon does not anticipate Claim 31 because of the use of ‘consisting of’ language.

However, Claim 31 also still contains ‘comprising’ language.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-1497. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Marc A Patterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794